

Question of Privilege—Mr. Fulton

namely the word "you" is not in order. Instead I am rising to ask the Government House Leader the customary question about House business.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, today we will continue with Bill C-18. Tomorrow I will call the capital punishment motion. Monday, June 8, has been designated an allotted day for the NDP. On Tuesday we will be proposing Ways and Means Motion No. 18. We will as well proceed with Bill C-50, the unemployment insurance Bill. I do not think there has to be an order but there is agreement among all Parties to complete this Bill in all stages and sit beyond six o'clock but no later than ten o'clock that day in order that the Bill might be completed in all stages.

On Wednesday I propose to call Bill C-59, the energy Bill, followed by Bill C-2, Canagrex, again with the assumption that those two Bills will be completed that day.

Thursday would be another allotted day and that would be the last allotted day and we will probably sit until ten o'clock, I guess.

On Friday, and this could change, my intention is to call Bill C-18.

I present this order of business notwithstanding the House order yesterday respecting Standing Orders taking effect next Monday. In light of this you will find unanimous consent to agree to the designation of the two allotted days next week, with one of them a votable day.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the NDP caucus we agree with what the Minister has said. I would also like to find out what the status is regarding the labelling of hazardous goods Bill. I understand there has been a request from the Minister that we pre-study this legislation. If that is the case, this is June 4 and I would like to know when the Government is going to allow for pre-study and what mechanism is going to be used.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Just before the Parliamentary Secretary answers, the House has heard the terms of the motion proposed by the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski). Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

• (1510)

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, there were some discussions among the Parties and I believe there is unanimous consent that a pre-study take place on that particular Bill. I have talked to the Minister and to the Chairman of the committee. It is my understanding that she will be organizing and calling a meeting very soon, which will enable the appropriate witnesses to be informed. I think that committee study should commence next week.

PRIVILEGE

INJUNCTION FILED BY ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Earlier today I filed with the Speaker's office my concerns regarding the June 2, 1987, documents filed by the Attorney General of British Columbia under Registry Number C82660 for interim interlocutory and permanent injunctions. I believe that I and all Members of the House of Commons have had our rights affected by this and that a substantial question of privilege exists. It reads in part as follows:

The Attorney General's claim is for interim, interlocutory, and permanent injunctions restraining the defendants, anyone acting on their behalf, and anyone having notice of this injunction, from:

"1. Advocating, or circulating any writing advocating, the use of force, including:

"(a) Work stoppages, slowdowns, study sessions—

(b) —pointing out errors in the government of the province, procuring alterations of any matter of government—

"3. Using force (including all that scribed in paragraph 1(a) hereof) as a means of accomplishing a governmental change in the province (including all that described in paragraph 1(b) hereof).

I am going to British Columbia on Saturday and will be attending what I suppose could be described as a study session with a number of those named as defendants in this document filed with the Supreme Court of British Columbia. I think it infringes on my rights and those of every Member of this House for the Government to bring before the Supreme Court an interim interlocutory and permanent injunction which states very specifically that anyone acting on behalf of the defendants or attending such things as study sessions is in fact in violation of such an injunction.

I have provided a copy of the documents which have been registered in Vancouver including the names of the plaintiffs and defendants in the action. I hope you will look with care at the effect this may have on any Member of Parliament, not only those from British Columbia who attends a study session where such things as government actions or ways of altering any matter that the Government might be considering are discussed. I think this strikes at the Charter and at the fundamental rights of the House of Commons.

The Speaker may well want to reflect on this for a day or two. If you decide that this does infringe upon my rights, which I believe it does, I hope I will have the opportunity to make the appropriate motion to refer this to the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure.

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if you were about to dismiss the application I would naturally resume my seat. We have heard the Hon. Member and I appreciate that he wants to focus attention on the provincial matters which are presently occurring in B.C. I have no objection to his doing that. However, I cannot see how the Member's privileges as a Member of this House are in any